REMARKS

Claims 1-26 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 21, 22, 24, and 25 are independent claims. Claims 2-20, 23, and 26 are dependent claims.

The March 16, 2005 Office Action indicated that claims 1-20 and 23-25 have been allowed, and that claims 21 and 22 have been rejected. The undersigned called the Examiner on April 13, 2005 regarding the status of claim 26. The Examiner indicated during the telephone call that claim 26 has been allowed.

Claim 22 has been amended to improve form without changing substance.

The specification and Fig. 2 have been amended to improve form. No new matter is being presented, and approval and entry are respectfully requested.

Changes to the Drawings

The attached drawing includes changes to FIG. 2 and replaces the original sheet including FIG. 2. In FIG. 2, the label for element 69 has been changed from "LOW-PASS FILTER" to correct a misprint. Also, the label for element 64 has been changed from "ANALOG-TO-DIGITAL CONVERTE R" TO "ANALOG-TO-DIGITAL CONVERTER" to improve form. No new matter has been added. Approval and entry of the attached replacement sheet is respectfully requested.

The Abstract

In numbered paragraph 1 on page 1 of the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that the application does not contain an abstract. An abstract was submitted with the application when filed on September 3, 2003, as indicated by the enclosed copy of the stamped return receipt postcard. For your convenience, a copy of the abstract has been attached to this Response.

IN THE DRAWINGS:

The attached drawing includes changes to FIG. 2 and replaces the original sheet including FIG. 2. In FIG. 2, the label for element 69 has been changed from "LOW-PASS FILTER." Also, the label for element 64 has been changed from "ANALOG-TO-DIGITAL CONVERTE."

Objections to the Specification

In numbered paragraph 2 on page 1 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the disclosure because of various informalities. Applicants submit that changes to the specification presented above correct the informalities. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objections to the specification.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

In numbered paragraph 4 on page 1 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 21 and 22 as being indefinite because of insufficient antecedent basis.

The Examiner stated that the limitation "the second predetermined polarization" in line 30 of claim 21 has insufficient antecedent basis. However, lines 13 and 14 of claim 21, as originally filed, recite "a second predetermined polarization," which provides the antecedent basis. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claim 21 under § 112, second paragraph.

The Examiner stated that the limitation "the first receiver" in line 16 of claim 22 has insufficient antecedent basis. This limitation has been replaced with "the receiving means." Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection to claim 22 under § 112, second paragraph.

Conclusion

In accordance with the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot, and further, that all pending claims patentably distinguish over the prior art. Thus, there being no further outstanding objections or rejections, the application is submitted to be in condition for allowance, which action is earnestly solicited.

If there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

Finally, if there are any additional fees associated with filing of this response, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 501121.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 9 May 05

Christine Joan Gilsdorf

Registration No. 43,635

U.S. Army Space and Missile Defense Command

(USASMDC) SMDC-LC-S

P.O. Box 1500

Huntsville, AL 35807-3801 Telephone: (256) 955-3213 Facsimile: (256) 955-1137